UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/682,417	10/09/2003	Ray W. Anderson	AUS920030746US1	9623

35525 7590 04/16/2007
IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER	
TURNER, ASHLEY D	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2109	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

TH

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/682,417	**Applicant(s)** ANDERSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Ashley D. Turner	**Art Unit** 2109	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 1-5,7-12,14-18,and 20 are rejected under U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non- statutory subject matter.

Independent claim 1 is drawn towards a method in a data processing for managing network addresses, the method comprising: comparing a received network address from a current server for use in identifying the data processing system with a prior network address from a previous server; creating a release data packet if the received network address is a new network address and the previous server is a different server than the current server, wherein the release data packet includes the prior network address; and sending the release data packet to the previous server, wherein the release data packet causes the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse. In order for a method claim to be statutory, it must result in useful, concrete, and tangible results. In this instance there is no tangible result of the method claimed. The mere act of "comparing a received network address from a current server for use in identifying the data processing system with a prior network address from a previous server; creating a release data packet if the received network address is a new network address and the previous server is a different server than the current server, wherein the release data packet includes the prior network address; and sending the release data packet to the previous server, wherein the release data packet causes the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse" does not create a tangible result, as it is not a "real world" result because it constitutes mere abstraction, nor is it stored in a memory.

Claims **2-5**, which are dependent on claim 1, do not add tangible results to the claim and thus are rejected for the same.

Independent claim 7 is drawn towards a data processing system unit connected to the bus system; a memory connected to the bus system, wherein the memory includes a set of instructions; and processing unit connected to the bus system, wherein the processing unit executes the set of instructions to compare a received network address from a current server for use in identifying the data processing system with a prior network address from a previous server; create a release data packet if the received network address is a new network address and the previous server is a different server than the current server in which the release data packet includes the prior network address; and send the release data packet to the previous server in which the release data packet causes the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse. In order for a system claim to be statutory, it must result in useful, concrete, and tangible results. In this instance there is no tangible result of the system claimed. The mere act of "a memory connected to the bus system, wherein the memory includes a set of instructions; and processing unit connected to the bus system, wherein the processing unit executes the set of instructions to compare a received network address from a current server for use in identifying the data processing system with a prior network address from a previous server; create a release data packet if the received network address is a new network address and the previous server is a different server than the current server in which the release data packet includes the prior network address; and send the release data packet to the previous server in which the release data packet causes the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse" does not create a tangible result, as it is not a "real world" result because it constitutes mere abstraction, nor is it stored in a memory.

Independent claim 8 is drawn towards a data processing system for managing network addresses, the data processing system comprising: comparing means for comparing a received network address from a current server for use in identifying the data processing system with a prior network address from a previous server; creating means for creating a release data packet if the received network address is a new network address and the previous server is a different server than the current server, wherein the release data packet includes the prior network address; and sending means for sending the release data packet to the previous server, wherein the release data packet causes the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse. In order for a system claim to be statutory, it must result in useful, concrete, and tangible results. In this instance there is no tangible result of the system claimed. The mere act of "comparing means for comparing a received network address from a current server for use in identifying the data processing system with a prior network address from a previous server; creating means for creating a release data packet if the received network address is a new network address and the previous server is a different server than the current server, wherein the release data packet includes the prior network address; and sending means for sending the release data packet to the previous server, wherein the release data packet causes the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse" does not create a tangible result, as it is not a "real world" result because it constitutes mere abstraction, nor is it stored in a memory.

Claims 9-12, which are dependent on claim 8, do not add tangible results to the claim and thus are rejected for the same.

Independent claim 14 is drawn towards a computer program product on a computer readable medium for managing network addresses, the computer program product comprising: first instructions for comparing a received network address from a current server for use in identifying the data processing system with a prior network address from a previous server; second instructions for creating a release data packet if the received network address is a new network address and the previous server is a different server than the current server, wherein the release data packet includes the prior network address; and third instructions for sending the release data packet to the previous server, wherein the release data packet causes the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse. In order for a system claim to be statutory, it must result in useful, concrete, and tangible results. In this instance there is no tangible result of the system claimed. The mere act of “comparing means for comparing a received network address from a current server for use in identifying the data processing system with a prior network address from a previous server; creating means for creating a release data packet if the received network address is a new network address and the previous server is a different server than the current server, wherein the release data packet includes the prior network address; and sending means for sending the release data packet to the previous server, wherein the release data packet causes the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse” does not create a tangible result, as it is not a “real world” result because it constitutes mere abstraction, nor is it stored in a memory.

Claims 15-18, and 20, which are dependent on claim 14, do not add tangible results to the claim and thus are rejected for the same

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Daizo (US 6,242,654) in view of Maufer (US 2003 /0233475 A1)

Referring to claim 1, Daizo discloses the limitations of a data processing system comprising: comparing a received network address from a current server for use in identifying the data processing system with a prior network address from a previous server; with a prior network address from a previous server;(Col. 5 lines 34- 38 The selector unit 12g compares two IP addresses 32 and 33 received from DHCP servers 11 and 21, respectively with the reference address 31 stored in the memory unit 12*f* and selects one of the DHCP servers for which a client requests permission to use an IP address.); creating a release data packet if the received network address is a new network address and the previous server is a different server that the current server, wherein the release data packet includes the prior network address" (Col.6 lines 5- 30 Fig 4 and Fig 5 The packet format comprises an op field 41, which indicates the type of message) Daizo did not disclose the limitation of "sending the release data packet to the previous server, wherein the release data packet causes the previous server to release the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse". The general concept of having the limitation of "sending the release data packet to the previous server, the release data packet causes the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse is well known in the art as taught by Maufer. Maufer discloses the limitation of sending the release data packet to the previous server, wherein the release data packet causes the previous server to release the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse". (Col.5 [0043] lines 6 –17 it will use DHCP to release one of the private addresses so that it can be assigned to another location). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Daizo to include the limitations of "sending the release data packet to the previous server, wherein the release data packet causes the previous server to release the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse" as taught by Maufer. This is advantageous in that IP addresses can be used efficiently, and network management can be simplified.

5. Claims 3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Daizo (US 6,242,654) and Maufer (US 2003 /0233475 A1) as applied to claim 1 further in view of Inoue (US 6,510,153 B1).

Referring to claims 3 and 10; Daizo and Maufer discloses all the limitations of claims 3 and 10 that is described above. Daizo did not disclose the limitation of "initiating the creating step only after the new network address has been bound to the data processing system" The general concept of "initiating the creating step only after the new network address has been bound to the data processing system" is well known in the art as taught by Inoue. Inoue discloses the limitation of "initiating the creating step only after the new network address has been bound to the data processing system" (Col.11 lines 58-67 An initialization DHCPDISCOVER message is transmitted, or a DHCPREQUEST message is transmitted on addition (at a DHCP processing unit 13 of

FIG. 6), and a DHCP address offered by a DHCPOFFER message returned in response to the DHCPDISCOVER message or a DHCP address acquired from a DHCPACK message returned in response to the DHCPREQUEST message is compared with the DHCP address stored in the DHCP address). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Daizo to include the limitations of" initiating the creating step only after the new network address has been bound to the data processing system" as taught by Inoue. No IP address is assigned to a second client while the first client's assignment is valid. This is advantageous in that IP addresses can be used efficiently, and network management can be simplified.

6. Claims 2, 9, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Daizo (US 6,242,654) and Maufer (US 2003 /0233475 A1) as applied to claim 1further in view of Mchosh (US 2003/0204611 A1).

Referring to claim 2, 9, and 15, Daizo and Maufer discloses all the limitations of claims 2, 9, and 15 that are described above. However, Daizo did not disclose, "The current server and the prior server are dynamic host configuration protocol servers." The general concepts of having "the current server and the prior server are dynamic host configuration protocol servers" are well known in the art as taught by McCosh. McCosh discloses, "The current server and the prior server are dynamic host configuration protocol servers." (Col. 4 [0036] When connected, the communications tester 10 is enabled to perform a DHCP exchange 157 with DHCP server 136. It is possible that a network has multiple DHCP servers, such as DHCP servers 134 and 136.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Daizo by Mchosh to include " the current server and the prior server are dynamic host configuration protocol servers" as taught by McCosh in order to ensure that all IP addresses are unique. No IP address is assigned to a second client while the first client's assignment is valid. Thus IP address pool management is done by the server.

7. Claims 4,11, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Daizo (US 6,242,654) and Maufer (US 2003 /0233475 A1) as applied to claim 1further in view of Meyer (US 6,289,378 B1).

Referring to claim 4, 11, and 17 Daizo and Maufer discloses all the limitations of claims 4, 11, and 17, which is described above. However, Daizo did not disclose the limitation of "the network address is an Internet protocol address." The general concept of "the network address is an Internet protocol address" is well known in the art as taught by Meyer. Myer discloses the limitation of " the network address is an Internet protocol address" (Col.6 lines 53-56 The shut down CGI application tells the Windows operating system running on the client computer to shutdown and reboot 765. After the client computer has rebooted, the computer will be configured on the new network IP address 770). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify Daizo by Meyer to include the limitation of " the network address is an Internet protocol address" as taught by Meyer in order to ensure that all IP addresses are unique. No IP address is assigned to a second client while the first client's assignment is valid. Thus IP address pool management is done by the server.

8. Claims 5, 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Daizo (US 6,242,654) and Maufer (US 2003 /0233475 A1) as applied to claim 1 further in view of Ju (US 2003/0067923 B1).

Referring to claims 5,12 and 18 Daizo and Maufer, discloses all the limitations of claims 5,12,18 which is described above. However, Daizo did not disclose the limitation of " the release data packet causes the previous server to send an update to a domain name server to delete an entry mapping the prior network address to a name for the data processing system." The general concept of " the release data packet causes the previous server to send an update to a domain name server to delete an entry mapping the prior network address to a name for the data processing system." is well known in the art as taught by Ju. Ju discloses the limitations " the release data packet causes the previous server to send an update to a domain name server to delete an entry mapping the prior network address to a name for the data processing system." (Col.8 [0130] In step S550, the packet data service node generates a DNS delete request message using the domain name and the mobile station, and transmits the generated DNS delete request message to the DNS server.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Daizo by Ju to include the limitation of "the release data packet causes the previous server to send an update to a domain name server to delete an entry mapping the prior network address to a name for the data processing system" as taught by Ju in order to ensure that all IP addresses are unique. No IP address is assigned to a second client while the first client's assignment is valid. Thus IP address pool management is done by the server.

9. Claims 6,13, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Daizo (US 6,242,654) and Maufer (US 2003 /0233475 A1) as applied to claim 1 further in view of Bing (US2004/0267837).

Referring to claim 6,13, and 19 Daizo and Maufer discloses all the limitations of claims 6,13, and19 which is described above. Daizo did not disclose the limitation of "storing the new network address and an identification of the current server in a log." The general concept of "storing the new network address and an identification of the current server in a log" is well known in the art as taught by Bing. Bing discloses the limitations of "storing the new network address and an identification of the current server in a log." (Col. 6 claim 21 wherein the update server us further configured to collect IP address of the network appliances in conjunction with periodic update requests store the IP addresses in a log). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Daizo by Bing to include the limitation of "storing the new network address and an identification of the current server in a log" as taught by Bing in order to ensure that all IP addresses are unique. No IP address is assigned to a second client while the first client's assignment is valid. Thus IP address pool management is don by the server.

10. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Schuauser (US 6,331,855 B1) and Daizo (US 6,242,654) further in view of Maufer (US2003 /0233475 A1).

Referring to claim 7 Schuauser discloses the limitations of "a data processing system for managing network addresses, the data processing system comprising: a bus system; a communications unit connected to the bus system; a memory connected to the bus system, wherein the memory includes a set of instructions; and a processing unit connected to the bus system, wherein the memory includes a set of instructions; and a processing unit connected to the bus system, wherein the processing unit executes the set of instructions" (Abstract. The present invention is a system and method for controlling information displayed on a first processor-based system, from a second processor-based system. A memory is to store instruction sequences by which the second processor –based system is processed) (Col. 4 lines 56-60 one with a co-processor that shares the system bus with the main CPU; a display processor that either shares the system bus and system memory or a display processor that has its own bus and memory system;) Schuauser did not disclose the limitations to "compare a received network address from a current server for use in identifying the data processing system with a prior network address from a previous server; "create a release data packet if the received network address is a new network a new network address and the previous server is a different server that the current server which the release data packet includes the prior network address" The general concept of having the limitations of compare a received network address from a current server for use in identifying the data processing system with a prior network address from a previous server; create a release data packet if the received network address is a new network a new network address and the previous server is a different server that the current server which the release data packet includes the prior network address" is well known in the art as taught by Daizo. Daizo discloses the limitations "comparing a received network address from a current server for use in identifying the data processing system with a prior network address from a previous server;(Col. 5 lines 34- 38 The selector unit 12g compares two IP addresses 32 and 33 received from DHCP servers 11 and 21, respectively with the reference address 31 stored in the memory unit 12*f* and selects one of the DHCP servers for which a client requests permission to use an IP address.); create a release data packet if the received network address is a new network a new network address and the previous server is a different server that the current server which the release data packet includes the prior network address with a prior network address from a previous server." (Col.6 lines 5- 30 Fig 4 and Fig 5 The packet format comprises an op field 41, which indicates the type of message). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Schuauser by Daizo to include the limitation "comparing a received network address from a current server for use in identifying the data processing system with a prior network address from a previous server; with a prior network address from a previous server; create a release data packet if the received network address is a new network a new network address and the previous server is a different server that the current server which the release data packet includes the prior network address" as taught by Daizo in order to ensure that all IP addresses are unique. No IP address is assigned to a second client while the first client's assignment is valid. Thus IP address pool management is done by the server.

Although the modified teachings of Schuauser show substantial features of the claimed invention, they further fail to expressly disclose: "send the release data packet to the previous server in which the release data packet causes the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse."

Nevertheless, "send the release data packet to the previous server in which the release data packet causes the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse" was well known in the art at the time of the claimed invention. In a similar field of endeavor, Maufer teaches: "send the release data packet to the previous server in which the release data packet causes the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse."(Col.5 [0043] lines 6 –17 it will use DHCP to release one of the private addresses so that it can be assigned to another location). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify Schuauser by Maufer to include the limitations of "sending the release data packet to the previous server, wherein the release data packet causes the previous server to release the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse" as taught by Maufer in order to ensure that all IP addresses are unique. No IP address is assigned to a second client while the first client's assignment is valid. Thus IP address pool management is done by the server.

11. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Viola (US 6,961,322) and Daizo (US 6,242,654) further in view of Maufer (US 2003 /0233475 A1).

Referring to claim 8,Viola discloses the limitations of a data processing system for managing network addresses, (Col. 1 [0001] The present invention pertains to internet networks and more particularly to a method for managing dynamic internet address leasing.)
Viola did not disclose the limitations of "comparing means for comparing a received network address from a current server for use in identifying the data processing system with a prior network address from a previous server; with a prior network address from a previous server; creating means for creating a release data packet if the received network address is a new network address and the previous server is a different server than the current server, the release data packet includes the prior network address; and sending means for sending the release data packet to the previous server, wherein the release data packet causes the previous server to release the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse". The general concept of having the

limitations of “comparing means for comparing a received network address from a current server for use in identifying the data processing system with a prior network address from a previous server; with a prior network address from a previous server; creating means for creating a release data packet if the received network address is a new network address and the previous server is a different server than the current server, wherein the release data packet includes the prior network address; is well known in the art as taught by Daizo. Daizo discloses the limitations “comparing means for comparing a received network address from a current server for use in identifying the data processing system with a prior network address from a previous server; with a prior network address from a previous server. (Col. 5 lines 34- 38 The selector unit 12g compares two IP addresses 32 and 33 received from DHCP servers 11 and 21, respectively with the reference address 31 stored in the memory unit 12*f* and selects one of the DHCP servers for which a client requests permission to use an IP address.) “creating means for creating a release data packet if the received network address is a new network address and the previous server is a different server than the current server, wherein the release data packet includes the prior network address” (Col.6 lines 5- 30 Fig 4 and Fig 5 The packet format comprises an op field 41, which indicates the type of message). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Viola by Inoue to include the limitation “comparing means for comparing a received network address from a current server for use in identifying the data processing system with a prior network address from a previous server; with a prior network address from a previous server; creating means for creating a release data packet if the received network address is a new network address and the previous server is a different server than the current server, wherein the release data packet includes the prior network address " as taught by Daizo in order to ensure that all IP addresses are unique. No IP address is assigned to a second client while the first client's assignment is valid. Thus IP address pool management is done by the server.

Although the modified teachings of Viola show substantial features of the claimed invention, they further fail to expressly disclose: "sending means for sending the release data packet to the previous server in which the release data packet causes the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse."

Nevertheless, "sending means for sending the release data packet to the previous server in which the release data packet causes the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse" was well known in the art at the time of the claimed invention. In a similar field of endeavor, Maufer teaches: "sending means for sending the release data packet to the previous server in which the release data packet causes the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse."(Col.5 [0043] lines 6 –17 it will use DHCP to release one of the private addresses so that it can be assigned to another location). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify Viola by Maufer to include the limitations of "sending means for sending the release data packet to the previous server, wherein the release data packet causes the previous server to release the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse" as taught by Maufer in order to ensure that all IP addresses are unique. No IP address is assigned to a second client while the first client's assignment is valid. Thus IP address pool management is done by the server.

12. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Meyer (US 6,289,378) and Daizo (US 6,242,654) further in view of Maufer (US 2003 /0233475 A1)

Referring to claim 14, Meyer discloses the limitations of a computer program in a data processing system for managing network addresses, (Col. 1 lines 35-40 A computer management system capable of managing computer programs, computer files, computer settings, peripheral settings and the like is controlled through the use of agents on the computers and a remote accessing program.) Meyer did not disclose the limitations of "comparing a received network address from a current server for use in identifying the data processing system with a prior network address from a previous server; with a prior network address from a previous server; creating a release data packet if the received network address is a new network address and the previous server is a different server than the current server, the release data packet includes the prior network address; and sending the release data packet to the previous server, wherein the release data packet causes the previous server to release the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse". The general concept of having the limitations of "first instructions for comparing a received network address from a current server for use in identifying the data processing system with a prior network address from a previous server; with a prior network address from a previous server; second instructions for creating a release data packet if the received network address is a new network address and the previous server is a different server than the current server, wherein the release data packet includes the prior network address; is well known in the art as taught by Daizo. Daizo discloses the limitation of "first instructions for comparing a received network address from a current server for use in identifying the data processing system with a prior network address from a previous server; with a prior network address from a previous server; second instruction for creating a release data packet if the received network address is a new network address and the previous server is a different server than the current server, wherein the release data packet includes the prior network address " It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Meyer by Daizo to include the limitation of " First instructions comparing a received network address from a current server for use in identifying the data processing system with a prior network address from a previous server; with a prior network address from a previous server." (Col. 5 lines 34-38 The selector unit 12g compares two IP addresses 32 and 33 received from DHCP servers 11 and 21, respectively with the reference address 31 stored in the memory unit 12*f* and selects one of the DHCP servers for which a client requests permission to use an IP address.) "Second instructions for creating a release data packet if the received network address is a new network address and the previous server is a different server than the current server, wherein the release data packet includes the prior network address " (Col.6 lines 5- 30 Fig 4 and Fig 5 The packet format comprises an op field

41, which indicates the type of message) as taught by Daizo in order to ensure that all IP addresses are unique. No IP address is assigned to a second client while the first client's assignment is valid. Thus IP address pool management is done by the server.

Although the modified teachings of Meyer show substantial features of the claimed invention, they further fail to expressly disclose: "sending the release data packet to the previous server, wherein the release data packet causes the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse."

Nevertheless, "sending the release data packet to the previous server, wherein the release data packet causes the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse" was well known in the art at the time of the claimed invention. In a similar field of endeavor, Maufer teaches: "sending means for sending the release data packet to the previous server, wherein the release data packet causes the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse." (Col.5 [0043] lines 6 –17 it will use DHCP to release one of the private addresses so that it can be assigned to another location). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify Meyer by Maufer to include the limitations of "sending means for sending the release data packet to the previous server, wherein the release data packet causes the previous server to release the prior network address for reuse" as taught by Maufer in order to ensure that all IP addresses are unique. No IP address is assigned to a second client while the first client's assignment is valid. Thus IP address pool management is don by the server.

13. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Meyer (US 6,289,378) and Maufer (US 2003 /0233475 A1) further in view of Inoue (US 6,510,153 B1) and of Anderson (US 7,152,118 B2)

Referring to claim 20 Meyer, Maufer, and Daizo disclose all the limitations described above. Meyer did not disclose the limitations of the "computer program product of claim 14, wherein the domain name server is located on a same data processing system as the previous server." The general concept of having the computer program product of claim 14, wherein the domain name server is located on a same data processing system as the previous server" is well known in the art as taught by Anderson. Anderson discloses the limitations of having the computer program product of claim 14, wherein the domain name server is located on a same data processing system as the previous server" (Col. 2 lines 63-65 Alternately, in accordance with an iterative resolution protocol, if the primary domain name server cannot provide the necessary mapping information, a failure message is sent to the CPE 102, which then sends a new query to additional assigned domain name servers(a secondary domain name server). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Maufer, Meyer and Atsushi to include "the computer program product of claim 14, wherein the domain name server is located on a same data processing system as the previous server" in order to provide a centralized DNS cache for resolving DNS queries generated by one or more CPE devices attached to a network.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashley d. Turner whose telephone number is 571-270-1603. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 7:30a.m. - 5:00p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frantz F. Jules can be reached on 571-272-6681. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Patent Examiner:

Ashley Turner

Date: 4/10/2007

Supervisory Patent Examiner

FRANTZ JULES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Frantz Jules

Date: